

Appl. No. 09/889,088  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 23 March 2004

Page 8 of 11

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

The Office action requests submission of a PTO-1449 (Information Disclosure Citation) corresponding to the information disclosure statement that was filed on 24 April 2002. Attached is an Information Disclosure Citation, with a copy of the referenced document.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, and 9-21 are pending in the application. Claims 9-21 are newly added. Claim 4 is rewritten in independent form.

The applicants respectfully request the Examiner to acknowledge the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. No new matter is added.

New dependent claims are added to at least partially restore the original range of claims that existed before multiple dependencies were removed in the preliminary amendment. No new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Tanioka (EP 0541295). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2, 6, 7, and newly added claims 9-16 depend, claims a display device that includes red, green, and blue subpixels, as well as a luminance-intensifying subpixel, wherein the determination of the value of the luminance-intensifying subpixel is based on both a minimum value and a maximum value of the input red, green, and blue pixel values. Tanioka specifically teaches the determination of the value of the luminance subpixel based only on the minimum of the red, green, and blue pixel values. Tanioka does not teach determining this luminance value based also on the maximum of the red, green, and blue pixel values.

Appl. No. 09/889,088  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 23 March 2004

Page 9 of 11

Claims 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15 specifically claim that the display device includes a memory for storing multiple functions for determining the luminance value, and a selector for selecting among these functions. Tanioka is silent with regard to providing a variety of selectable functions for determining the luminance value.

Claims 7, 12, 13, and 16 specifically claim the selective display of only the red, green, and blue subpixels based on a control signal. Tanioka is silent with regard to selectively enabling and disabling the luminance sub-pixel based on a control signal.

Based on the above remarks, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, and 7, and favorably consideration of claims 9-16, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Tanioka.

Claim 4, upon which newly added claims 17-21 depend, claims a display device that includes red, green, and blue subpixels, as well as a luminance-intensifying subpixel, wherein the determination of the value of the luminance-intensifying subpixel is given by the formula:  $W=\text{Max}^{\alpha}\{(Y_{\min}+\alpha)/(\text{MAX}+\beta)\}^n$ , where at least one of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  is non-zero. Tanioka does not teach this equation.

Claims 17, 18, 19, and 20 specifically claim that the display device includes a memory for storing multiple functions for determining the luminance value, and a selector for selecting among these functions. Tanioka is silent with regard to providing a variety of selectable functions for determining the luminance value.

Claims 19, 20, and 21 specifically claim the selective display of only the red, green, and blue subpixels based on a control signal. Tanioka is silent with regard to selectively enabling and disabling the luminance sub-pixel based on a control signal.

Based on the above remarks, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claim 4, and favorably consideration of claims 17-21, under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Tanioka.

Appl. No. 09/889,088  
Amendment and/or Response  
Reply to Office action of 23 March 2004

Page 10 of 11

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott  
Reg. 41,508  
Atty for Applicant(s)

1824 Federal Farm Road  
Montross, VA 22520  
Phone: (804) 493-0707  
Fax: (215) 243-752